

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weissman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,524) in view of Tse et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,544). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The cited references describe methods for populating datamarts. According to Weissman, a “Datamart or Data Warehouse – is a database.” (col. 6, lines 1-2). And according to Tse, “A Datamart is a database, or collection of databases” (col. 1, lines 8-10). Both of the cited references focus on extracting data from a data warehouse and populating specific datamarts whereas, Applicants’ claims recite a method of calculating a measure.

As to claims 1 and 6, the Examiner has generally cited the “datamart structure” as being the “allocated level for the measure” as recited in claims 1 and 6. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s comparison of ‘datamart structure’ to ‘allocated level’ is misplaced. First, in the cited sections, Weissman generally describes the advantages of datamarts as compared to On Line Transaction Processing (OLTP). Further, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, in the cited sections, Weissman does not describe a method of calculating a measure as recited in claims 1 and 6. Instead, Weissman provides a comparison between atomic level data transaction queries of OLTP and general support of queries at a ‘much higher level’ in datamarts. Weissman does not describe determining at least one allocated level for the measure, as recited in claims 1 and 6.

Further, the cited passage of col. 6, lines 17-25 of Weissman have no bearing on the rejected claims 1 and 6. In the cited sections, Weissman provides general definitions of terms such as, “fact table,” “measurement,” and “dimension.” These terms are generally known in the art. With these definitions, Weissman does not show, teach, or suggest selecting a first star from a first star group associated with the measure, wherein the first star supports the at least one allocation level for the measure as recited in claims 1 and 6.

Further, applicants respectfully submit that reliance on Tse et al. is also misplaced. In the cited sections, Tse et al. describes populating datamarts from one set of transactional data in a single aggregation generation process where “[e]ach datamart can represent a different star schema, contain different dimension attributes and different aggregation.” (col. 8, lines 17-19).

Tse et al. does not describe calculating a measure. In contrast, Tse et al. describes population of datamarts where the star schemas are associated with datamarts. The star schemas in Tse et al. are not selected for calculating a measure. Tse et al. does not teach selecting a second star from a second star group associated with a control measure, for calculating the measure as recited in claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, claims 1 and 6 are patentably distinguishable from the cited reference. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 6 and the claims depending from those claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim 2 and 7 depend on claim 1 and 6 respectively and are patentably distinguishable from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 6 respectively. Further, the Examiner has stated that ‘comparing the requested levels’ as recited in claims 2 and 7, read on ‘indicating relationships’ in the cited sections of Weissman (col. 12, lines 24-40). Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, the cited sections do not describe comparing the requested levels to a lowest level star in the first star group as recited in claims 2 and 7. In contrast, the cited sections of Weissman describe top level Metadata schema including the relationships between various dimension tables of the schema. The relationships between the tables are at the same level. These tables are not the actual fact tables but the definition of the fact tables as described by Weissman (*See* col. 13, lines 14-21). Further in the cited sections, Weissman does not describe selecting for each requested level a minimum of the requested level and corresponding dimension levels associated with the star as recited in claims 2 and 7. Accordingly, claims 2 and 7 are patentably distinguishable from the cited reference. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 and 7 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 3 and 8 depend on claims 1 and 6 respectively and are patentably distinguishable from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 6. Further, the Examiner has repeated the citations from Weissman used in rejecting claims 1 and 6 without considering the limitations of claims 3 and 8. The cited sections of Weissman do not describe calculating the measure for the allocated level and calculating the control measure for the requested levels as recited in claims 3 and 8. In contrast, the cited sections of Weissman describe various query mechanism metadata including measurement metadata. Weissman further describes measurement metadata in col. 33, lines 20-63 however, Weissman does not teach calculating control measures for the requested levels as recited in claims 3 and 8. Accordingly, claims 3 and

8 are patentably distinguishable from the cited reference. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3 and 8 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 4 and 9 depend on claims 1 and 6 respectively and are patentably distinguishable from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 6. Further, in the cited sections, Weissman does not describe allocated level with no star. In contrast, Weissman describes a ‘team key’ to introduce an associative table between the actual dimension table and a given fact table (*See col. 26, lines 24-27*). The team key is stored in each fact row for activities representing the team table (col. 26, lines 29-30). Thus, the associative table is part of the given fact table via the team key.

Further, the cited passage of Tse et al. have no bearing on the rejected claims 4 and 9. The Examiner has stated that ‘no star’ reads on ‘not involved in the cross product’ in the cited sections of Tse et al. (col. 2, lines 4-42). In contrast, Tse et al. specifically describes an “all values” level in each dimension which is used in cross products when the corresponding dimension is not involved in the cross product. Thus, a single format for cross product is defined, each containing a level from every dimension which are included in a given fact table which represents a star (*See col. 2, lines 25-28*). Accordingly, Weissman and Tse et al. taken alone or in combination do not disclose determining the allocated levels wherein no star exists which supports the measure at the requested levels as recited in claims 4 and 9. Accordingly, claims 4 and 9 are patentably distinguishable from the cited reference. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4 and 9 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 5 and 10 depend on claims 1 and 6 respectively and are patentably distinguishable from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 6. Further, in rejecting claims 5 and 10, the examiners has combined non-related terms from Weissman. Examiner has cited terms ‘predefined’ and ‘the filters allow the user to filter’ of Weissman at col. 8, lines 54-67 and col. 9, lines 1-29 in rejecting ‘predetermined measure’ and ‘control measure’ as recited in claims 5 and 10. In the cited sections, Weissman uses ‘predefined’ for ‘data semantics’ that are used for creation and population of datamarts (col. 8, lines 66-67). Whereas, the ‘filters’ allow the user to filter different fields out of the datamart. These filters are used to eliminate certain fields from the reports generated from previously created and populated datamarts.

Further Weissman, describes that the reporting process 104 uses the measurement information 169 that is already available for query and reporting. In contrast, claims 5 and 10 recite the control measure is a predetermined measure associated with the measure. Accordingly, claims 5 and 10 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5 and 10 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing comments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all claims. Applicants believe that all necessary fees are enclosed with this response. In the event, however, that any additional fees are required to complete this filing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees, or credit any overpayment, to Account No. 13-0480, Attorney Docket No. 68110328.713.

If Examiner has any questions regarding this Amendment and Response to Office Action or the Application in general, Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,



Abdul R. Zindani, Reg. No. 46,091
Baker & McKenzie
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(214) 978-3000
(214) 978-3099 (fax)